DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 459 RC 014 680

AUTHOR Whitaker, William H.
TITLE The Many Faces of Ephraim: In Search of A Functional Typology of Rural Areas.
SPONS AGENCY Maine Univ., Orono.
PUB DATE Jul 82
GRANT 5-4-26099
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual National Institute on Social Work in Rural Areas (7th, Dubuque, IA, July 26, 1982).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Census Figures; Culture; *Definitions; Economics; Farm Occupations; Literature Reviews; Occupations; *Rural Areas; Rural Environment; Rural Nonfarm Residents; Rural Population; *Rural Urban Differences; *Social Work; *Sociology

ABSTRACT

The literature of social work and rural sociology lacks conceptualization of the term "rural" and treats the term imprecisely. According to a 1960 survey, authors dealing with rural/urban differences do not agree on the attributes of "rural." However, if the rural concept is to be a useful analytical tool and guide to social work practice, its attributes should be specified carefully. Traditionally, the term "rural" pertains to areas of low population density, small absolute size, and relative isolation, but the definition is confused by the appearance in the literature of the rural/urban continuum. Rural sociologists should seek a dynamic rather than a static distinction of rural/urban differences, which would focus on social class, power relationships, and changes in roles and networks. Sociologists have proposed rural definitions based on occupation (focusing on farming and excluding other rural occupations), sociocultural constructs (focusing on human behavior and values resulting from population and culture), ecology (focusing on the distribution of people in space and based on population statistics, social service system organizations, or Marxian concepts of superstructure and infrastructure), and multidimensional considerations (such as metropolitan proximity and number of urban residents). (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242459

"THE MANY FACES OF EPHRAIM: IN SEARCH OF A FUNCTIONAL TYPOLOGY OF RURAL AREAS"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William H. Whitaker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By

William H. Whitaker, Ph.D., ACSW
Associate Professor of Social Welfare

Department of Sociology and Social Work
University of Maine at Orono

Prepared for presentation at the
Seventh Annual National Institute on Social Work in Rural Areas
Clark College, Dubuque, Iowa

July 26, 1982

Preparation of this article has been supported in part by University of Maine at Orono Faculty Research Fund Grant, No. 5-4-26099.

RC014680

"The Many Faces of Ephraim: In Search of a Functional Typology of Rural Areas"

> At first thought nothing seems more apparent than the difference between the city and the country. The contrasts between the two are so sharp. But one who attempts . . . to distinguish accurately between rural and urban, is immediately confronted with some serious difficulties, obstacles which are not immediately perceptible.
>
> A.F. Weber, The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century, 1899.[1]

During the past decade there has been a rebirth of interest in social work as practiced in small communities and rural areas. The momentum generated by the Southern Regional Education Board (Levin, 1972), the early writing of Ginsberg and his colleagues (1971; 1973; 1976), and the work of the chimerical and irrepressible Rural Caucus has now been maintained through six volumes of Human Services in the Rural Environment and seven National Institutes on Social Work in Rural Areas. Thanks to Emilia Martinez-Brawley, our historical roots are being rediscovered (1980a; 1980c) and progress is being made toward a more scientific approach to rural practice (1979; 1980b; 1981). Recently the first modern textbook in rural social work practice has appeared (Farley, Griffiths, Skidmore and Thackeray, 1982). However, while great advances have been made, we have a long way to go.

As early as 1971 Ginsberg reported in the Encyclopedia of Social Work that there had been "little systematic inquiry into the characteristics of effective social work practice in rural communities" (p. 1143). Ten years later Martinez-Brawley and Munson (1981) pointed out that the literature of rural social work remains overwhelmingly descriptive and anecdotal. If social workers are to have greater impact on rural policy and practice, they argued, our research must become more empirical, methodologically sound, replicable and cumulative. My own review finds that much of the rural social work literature either lacks conceptualization or treats the concepts "rural" and "community" imprecisely. The extensive variations in style, customs, economic circumstance, demographics, geography and topography among rural communities have contributed to the lack of a universally accepted definition of rural among social workers (Jenkins and Cook, 1981, p. 414). Rural is used willy-nilly to describe locality characteristics, personal attributes, and social work practice skills. The description of rural eccentricities which constitutes much of the literature is, however, an insufficient foundation for social work theory and practice. Conceptualization, too, is necessary. As Carl Taylor, a leading rural sociologist of the 1940's, put it:

> Conceptualization is essential to classification of knowledge and classification is the first step in scientific analysis. A concept is both definitive and interpretative. It is definitive in that it prescribes that this datum is included within and that datum is excluded from a class or type of phenomena. It provides interpretation in that once a phenomenon is assigned its place in a type or class, all that is known about other phenomena included in that class can be used to help understand it (Loomis and Beegle, 1950, p. v).

Roland Warren (1978, p. 9) has provided a concept of community that is useful for rural studies. A community, he said, is the combination of social units and systems that perform the major locality-relevant social functions of production-distribution-consumption, socialization, social control, social participation, and mutual support. The extensive alterations in these locality-relevant functions which have taken place and continue to occur in rural communities constitute what Warren labels the "great change" and have enormous relevance for rural social work practice. The great change includes increases in division of labor, differentiation of interests and association, systematic relations to the larger society, bureaucratization and impersonalization, transfer of functions to profit enterprise and government, urbanization and suburbanization, and changes in values (pp. 52-53).

Much of the current interest in social work in rural areas may be motivated by a desire on the part of social workers to escape, to adapt to, or to counter the effects of the "great change." Contemporary rural social work may be understood as an offspring of the community movement akin to that movement's expressions through suburbanization, neighborhood and local control, administrative decentralization, participatory democracy, black power, and alternative institutions (cf. Warren, 1978, pp. 343-354). The sociological literature dealing with social movements as a form of collective behavior should offer insight into the rural social work movement. It would be interesting, for example, to employ a social movement framework for the comparison of contemporary rural social work with the Country Life Movement of the early 1900's.

In the present paper, however, I will focus on the several ways in which "rural" has been defined in the literature of social work and rural sociology. The paper begins by considering whether such a distinction is

significant and by noting some of the difficulties encountered in attempts to distinguish rural from urban. I then describe and comment upon four differing approaches to such distinctions. I will consider in turn occupational, sociocultural, ecological and multidimensional conceptions of rurality.

Distinguishing "Rural" and "Urban"

Is it important to distinguish rural from urban? There are rural sociologists and social workers who question the sociological significance of the concepts rural and urban for modern society (Pahl, 1965; Osgood, 1977; Munson, 1980) and who urge moving beyond rural/urban comparisons and focusing on the problems of rural people rather than worrying very much about who is or is not rural. They make an important point. Social workers should keep their "eyes on the prize" of amelioration. Nevertheless, confusion in the social work literature retards social progress. If we are to move forward, we must understand where we are and where we have been.

If "rural" is to become a useful analytical tool and guide to social work practice, we must be able to operationalize the concept, to separate out its component parts and to specify those attributes which distinguish rural from urban/metropolitan/nonrural. If these tasks cannot be achieved, or if, having accomplished them, not much of significance results from our labors, we would be justified in setting aside the concept as a perhaps interesting but nonproductive detour in our quest for universal social and economic justice (cf. Bealer, Willits, and Kuvlesky, 1965, p. 257).

In the United States "rurality" has referred traditionally to areas of low population density, small absolute size, and relative isolation. The major economic base was agricultural production. The way of life of the people was reasonably homogeneous and was differentiated from that of

other sectors of society, most notably the "city" (Bealer, et al., 1965, p. 256). Following Wirth's seminal article, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," (1938) rural sociologists attempted to discern "the forms of social action and organization that typically emerge" in various settings (Dewey, 1960, pp. 62-63). Their work generated a remarkable lack of consensus.

In 1960 Dewey surveyed the work of eighteen authors dealing with rural/urban distinctions and identified 40 items on which rural and urban areas were presumed to differ. Urban areas were deemed more likely than rural ones to be characterized by: heterogeneity, impersonal relations, division of labor, mobility, segmented roles, class differences, predatory relations, emphasis on time, new family role, employment patterns, more female employment, multiple dwelling units, secularism, non-agricultural life, cosmopolitanism, tenancy, complexity, tolerance, superficiality, low fertility, sophistication, commercialization, liberalism, automation, utilitarianism, formal controls, interdependency, subjective outlook, intense occupational space, social participation, transiency, individualism, objectivity, and practicality. The similarity to descriptions cited in the contemporary literature of rural social work is striking.

Of all the presumed rural/urban descriptors only heterogeneity was listed by a majority of the sociologists. Sixteen items were mentioned only once, 9 twice and 10 by only three writers. The only thing that seemed to be agreed upon, Dewey writes, was that "in some vague ways" rural and urban seemed to be "related to city and country, to community variations in size and density of population" (p. 60). Considering the degree of definitional confusion among rural sociologists, it is not surprising that Webster and Campbell (1977) report comparable diversity of opinion among rural social workers who were asked to identify contextual differences in the rural social work environment.

Some of the difficulty in distinguishing conceptually between rural and urban is a result of the impossibility of delineating the two based on simple statistical categories and the near impossibility of determining whether given borderline characteristics should be classified rural or urban (Bertrand, 1958, p. 9). One historical debate in the literature of rural sociology was over whether rural-urban concepts were dichotomous or formed a continuum. Proponents of the former saw differences between the two populations as categoric. Characteristics were either rural or urban. Adherents of the continuum perspective saw rural/urban differences shading or blending together in a range between the two polar extremes (Bertrand, 1958, pp. 24-25). A simple rural/urban dichotomy was held to be unsatisfactory for two reasons. Instead of being purely rural or purely urban, communities tend to be rural or urban in comparison with others. Also, there is no single simple characteristic upon which rural and urban communities differ. To be adequate, a rural/urban distinction must be "based upon a series of mutually dependent and functionally related characteristics" (Smith, 1953, pp. 16-17).

The notion of a rural/urban continuum suggests that we live in a unitary society rather than one divided into rural and urban branches. The growth of national media contributes to this unification but does not inevitably lead to the extinction of rural/urban differences. Dewey (1960) considered the rural/urban continuum real but relatively unimportant. In his view there was:

> no such thing as urban culture or rural culture but only various cultural contents somewhere on the rural/urban continuum. The movement of zoot suits, jazz, and antibiotics from city to country is no more a spread of urbanism than is the transfer or diffusion of blue jeans,

> square dancing, and tomatoes to the cities a movement of ruralism to urban centers. There can be, and most assuredly are, small rural communities which are secular, civilized, dynamic, and highly literate as well as large sacred, essentially primitive, illiterate, and relatively static urban communities (p. 65).

The rural/urban continuum concept appears also in the literature of rural social work. Richard DuBord, for example, has proposed a continuum based on relative size and density ranging from "absolute rural" (isolated farm residence) to "absolute urban" (metropolis 1,000,000+). Intermediate categories include rural neighborhoods; villages under 2,500; small towns 2,500-9,999; small cities 10,000-49,999; cities 50,000-499,999; suburbs; and large cities 500,000-999,999 (Farley, et al., 1982, p. 6). Continua based on population, however, are open to criticism. On what bases are suburbs, for example, located between "cities" and "large cities" in a continuum?

Commenting on the persistence of "urban villages" (Gans, 1962) in which people with rural characteristics constitute neighborhoods within the metropolis, Pahl (1965) contended that settlement types are less important determinants of ways of life than are class and life-cycle characteristics. And I agree. "Some people," he said, "are in the city but not of it, whereas others are of the city but not in it" (p. 327). In his view a continuum based on settlement type is static and neglects the dynamic processes of change in individuals and in their economic and political environments which take place in even the most rural communities. Since these sorts of changes are precisely those of interest to social work, we, too, should seek dynamic rather than static rural/urban distinctions. This suggests a focus on social

class, power relationships, and on changes in role and networks.

In his view of empirical community studies from various parts of the world Pahl reported a common theme of local/national confrontation that was equally likely to occur in urban as in rural physical settings. "There are," he stated,

> a whole series of continua, which together form a process, acting not so much on communities as on groups and individuals at particular places in the social structure. Rather than a (rural/urban) continuum it would be better to imagine a whole series of meshes of different textures superimposed in each other, together forming a process which is creating a much more complex pattern (p. 327).

Consequently, he concluded "Any attempt to tie particular patterns of social relationships to specific geographical milieux is a singularly fruitless exercise" (p. 322).

This raises an interesting possibility for those of us concerned with social work in rural areas. Might not "grass-roots," or "local" or "community" social work be a more felicitous and useful concept than "rural" social work? Any of these terms could encompass rural settings and also urban villages and neighborhoods. The parallels between the "urban" settlement movement and rural social work are significant. Both seek social and economic justice for oppressed people. Both attempt to create a community of concern through primary group relationships. Both deal with networks of informal helpers as well as formal agencies and programs. Both utilize the methods of community organization and advocacy. Recognition of these commonalities can reduce both rural and inner city provincialism and lessen the likelihood that the rural and urban working classes will be pitted against one another.

In an attempt to explore rurality analytically rather than merely descriptively several rural sociologists (Bealer, et al., 1965; Willits, Bealer, and Crider, 1981) have proposed occupational, ecological and socio-cultural categorization of definitions of rural. Although these dimensions are frequently combined,[2] they are not necessarily interrelated. It is important to explore the dimensions independently before a multi-dimensional definition of rurality is proposed and its components weighted.

Occupational Definitions of Rural

The man on the street tends to equate rural with farm. And there is a tradition in U.S. rural sociology of focus on farming to the exclusion of rural non-farm occupations. Charles Josiah Galpin, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics was in charge of rural life work for the University of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture. Writing in 1918, Galpin used the term rural to refer only to isolated individual farms. In his view, any clustering of people "whether in the grade of hamlet, village or city" was urban (pp. 28-30). Forty years later rural sociologist Alvin Bertrand (1958), in spite of his recognition of the existence of nonfarm rural residents, continued to use the term rural interchangeably with rural-farm or farmer. As recently as 1972 in a sociology doctoral dissertation (Wooster) respondents were categorized rural if they currently lived on a farm, had been raised on a farm, had parents who were farmers, currently worked in an occupation related to farming, or were married to any of these (Osgood, 1977, p. 43). Today rural occupations include mining, forestry, fishing, rural manufacturing, and corporate farming in addition to the traditional family farm which was the referent of the country lifers and early rural sociologists. These occupations vary extensively. The roles

performed within them (migrant worker versus foreman versus owner; herring fisherman versus sardine packer; etc.) vary so much that occupation seems a most tenuous basis for defining rural.

Sociocultural Definitions of Rural

A second category of definitions of rural consists of sociocultural constructs referring to human values and behavior. Several writers have proposed that the problems of definition be sidestepped by simply asking respondents to identify themselves as rural or urban (Osgood, 1977, p. 43; Bachrach, 1981; Martinez-Brawley, 1980b). Hauser (1965, p. 9) has pointed out that definition may be related to considerations of administration, politics, history and culture as well as to those of demography. The area surrounding Bangor, Maine, for example, changed from rural to urban literally overnight in 1981 through political/administrative redefinition as a new SMSA (standard metropolitan statistical area). As a consequence, the several redesignated communities became eligible for certain federal grant programs and ineligible for others.

Dewey (1960) has suggested that much of the confusion in the sociological literature over urban and rural results from the failure to separate the effects of population from those of culture. This, he said, was the mistake made by Wirth (1938) and repeated by many other sociologists. For Wirth the urban personality was largely the consequence of population density, number and heterogeneity. Wirth believed urbanites and ruralites differed in:

> reserve, blasé outlook, indifference; sophistication and cosmopolitanism; rationality; relativistic perspectives; tolerant, competitive, self-aggrandizing, and exploitative attitudes; feelings of friction, irritation, and nervous tension bred by frustration; acceptance of

> instability and insecurity; tolerance of eccentricity and novelty and approval of efficiency and inventions; and marked degrees of personal disorganization (Dewey, 1960, pp. 61-62).

A similarly long list of qualities of urban social organization which Wirth believed to stem from the same three variables is cited in those same pages.

Mingled with the cultural items in Wirth's long lists of urban characteristics, Dewey found five qualities which he believed might plausibly be maximized in urban areas and minimized in rural ones. They are: anonymity, division of labor, heterogeneity, impersonal formal relationships, and status symbols independent of personal acquaintance (1960, pp. 64-65). Looking through the other end of the telescope, rural areas would be expected to be characterized by visibility, lack of specialized labor (therefore, generalist social work), homogeneity, personal informal relationships, and status based upon personal acquaintance. Not surprisingly, these are among the qualities frequently alluded to in the literature of rural social work. They exist and should be taken into account by planners and social workers practicing in rural areas.

Ecological Definitions of Rural

Ecological constructs refer to the distribution of people in space (size, density, isolation) and constitute the third category of definitions or rural. Rural sociologists such as Smith (1953, p. 15) have argued that rural and urban populations differ in large part because of the different environments which impinge upon them. Such concepts may seem useful to social workers accustomed to thinking about persons in situations. Rural sociologists, however, have tended to take a relatively narrow view emphasizing climate, geography and topography over the socio-economic and socio-political aspects of environment.

The most common ecological definitions of rurality consider population size and density as independent variables. This is the approach followed by the United States Bureau of the Census, by many rural sociologists and numerous social workers. Durkheim (1897) provides the theoretical foundation for that orientation. "Social life," he wrote:

> rests on a substratum where its size as well as its form is determined. This substratum is constituted by the mass of individuals who make up society, the way in which they are distributed on the soil, and the nature and configuration of all sorts of things that affect collective relationships. The social substratum differs according to whether the population is large or small and more or less dense, whether it is concentrated in cities or dispersed over the countryside. . . . (Cited in Hauser, 1965, p. 11).

The U.S. Bureau of the Census since 1790 has collected the data upon which many sociologists and social workers have relied for their definitions of rural. The Census definitions are based mainly on size of place as measured by population. Typically, the Census defines urban places and calls what is left over "rural." The term rural was first used by the Census in 1874 when it was defined as the population of a county exclusive of any cities or towns having 8,000 or more inhabitants. In the Census of 1880 the urban threshhold was reduced to 4,000. In 1890 it was further reduced to 1,000 but then increased to 2,500 in 1900. With some modifications the Census concept of rural as any place with fewer than 2,500 population remains in use today. In 1920, at the urging of rural economist Charles Galpin, the rural category was subdivided into rural-farm and rural-nonfarm in recognition of the major differences between these populations. Rural farm/nonfarm distinctions are made by farm size and value of sales of farm products.

People who live in rural territory on ten or more acres of land and sell farm products annually worth $50 or more and people living on smaller places but selling $250 or more per year in farm products are classified rural-farm. All other rural residents are counted in the nonfarm category. In 1950 the classification of the "urban fringe" (the continuously built up areas surrounding cities of 50,000 or more people) was changed from rural to urban. Thus rural became a more homogeneous category defined as what remained after incorporated and unincorporated places with 2,500 or more inhabitants and the urban fringe areas had been substracted from the total population (Truesdale, 1949; U.S. Census Bureau, 1975). Essentially the same definitions were followed in 1960 and 1970.

Social workers, like rural sociologists, have tended to fall into the "trap of the U.S. Census" in relying on population size to define rural. The Social Work Encyclopedia follows the Census definitions and uses "the terms rural, small town, and nonmetropolitan . . . interchangeably to describe communities of fewer than 50,000" persons (Martinez-Brawley, 1980b, p. 27). Similar definitions were employed by social workers Ginsberg (1977), Osgood (1977), and Yoelin and Krishnef (1980). Munson (1978), in his study of rural/urban differences in social work manpower, treated entire states as rural or urban according to their population size. In doing so he ignored the substantial rural populations of the ten most populous states and the urban populations of the smallest states.[3] Government agencies also frequently employ numerical definitions but seldom agree exactly where to draw the line of rural demarcation. A report of the Maine State Planning Office (1979, p. 1) lists official governmental definitions of 1,500; 2,500; 4,000; 5,000; 20,000; 25,000; and 50,000. A sample of the many divergent definitions used by governmental agencies is given in

Ecosometrics (1981, pp. 9-13).

Wijnberg and Colca (1981) propose an ecological approach that shifts away from dependence on population statistics. They classify rural areas according to degree of social service system organization. Highly organized, minimal or nonexistent social service systems are key independent variables from their perspective.

Another ecological approach to distinguishing rural from urban has been proposed by Martinez-Brawley and Munson (1981). Borrowing from the work of Marxist anthropologist Maurice Godelier (1978), they suggest infrastructure and superstructure as concepts for categorizing rural/urban differences. Infrastructure denotes "the specific ecological and geographical conditions within which a society exists and from which it extracts its material means of existence" (p. 25). The rural infrastructure is characterized by spatial isolation, lack of transportation, difficulties in service coordination, high service cost, lack of variety in service and facilities, and lack of service access. Superstructure consists of "variables which relate to rural culture and creed, family structure, natural helping systems, responses to change, etc." (p. 25).

If these terms are used merely to rename categories, they will offer little theoretical advantage over Dewey's (1960) distinction between population demographics and culture or the Bealer, et al. (1965) occupational, ecological and sociocultural categories. If infrastructure and superstructure provide a link between social workers and the literature of theoretical Marxism, their introduction may contribute significantly to the achievement of social and economic justice by the rural and urban working class. From this perspective the relatively static aspects of the infrastructure seem less important than the dynamic aspects of class and role

relationships and power all of which are more closely associated with superstructure. It should be noted as well that use of these terms links us to the investigation of class, roles, network and life cycle proposed earlier by Pahl (1965).

In their attempt to apply infrastructure and superstructure while at the same time recognizing the enormous variation in rural areas, Martinez-Brawley and Munson veer dangerously near the quicksand of idiosyncratic description. They warn that "while there are infrastructure variables common to all rural areas, social work researchers need to be more sensitive to special variables that make certain areas unique." They urge the researcher "to select those descriptors which best paint an accurate portrayal of the locale in question " (pp. 26-27). Theory-building requires research that goes beyond description to comparison. Both differences and similarities must be taken into account. Patterns must be searched for even within difference. Systematic use of concepts such as infrastructure and superstructure which can be applied to a variety of rural settings (and to non-rural situations as well) is necessary, if we are to develop theory which is relevant to innovation in social welfare policy and social work practice.

Multidimensional Definitions of Rural

Kretz (1981, pp. 15-17) discusses several problems encountered in studies using Census definitions of "rural"--places less than 2,500, etc.--and "nonmetropolitan"--areas outside metropolitan areas of 50,000 or more and outside the urban fringe of such areas. There is, first of all, the temptation to use the terms interchangeably even though many rural residents would consider at least the larger nonmetro areas as "big city." Second,

some 55 percent of the rural population lives in metropolitan counties or in counties immediately adjacent to metropolitan counties. Life experiences such as access to social services for rural persons in those counties likely differ from those of rural residents in more "purely" rural counties.

To compensate for differences in the nonmetropolitan counties the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Hines, Brown and Zimmer, 1975) has developed a classification which delineates nonmetro counties by "number of urban residents and geographic proximity to a metro area" (p. 3). In this classification counties are classified as greater metropolitan, medium metropolitan, small metropolitan, urbanized adjacent, urbanized not adjacent, less urbanized adjacent, less urbanized not adjacent, totally rural adjacent and totally rural not adjacent.

The Maine State Planning Office (1979) has developed an interesting ten category urban/rural typology. State planners were concerned that some Maine communities seemed rural in some regards but urban in others, that different communities seemed rural in different ways, and that different policies might be required to address the varying aspects of rural community life.

The planners began by conceptualizing ideal type urban, suburban and rural communities. They then selected twelve indicators which were believed to be relevant to the ideal types and for which data were available. Indicators included number of year-round residents; percent of housing located in dense, compact settlements; percent of housing located in multi-unit structures; persons per household; percent of resident workers employed in farming or fishing; monthly fluctuations in employment in the community; degree to which jobs are concentrated in a few industries; degree to which jobs are concentrated in a few establishments; number of jobs per resident

worker; workers per person; number of establishements offering goods and services; and diversity of trade and services available. To these were added three additional indicators believed to be potentially important for policy making: ratio of peak seasonal population to year-round residents; percent ofyear-round residents living in group quarters; and percent of housing built prior to 1940.

A study of Maine communities in which all fifteen indicators were taken into account resulted in a ten category typology including three urban types (trade and employment centers; small economically diversified cities; small economically specialized cities), five types of rural suburbs (typical suburban; new suburbs; old suburbs; suburban fringe; dependent suburbs), and two types of primary industry towns (primary industry trade centers; small primary industry towns).

Only primary industry communities (10 percent of all Maine communities) reflect the traditional rural notion of being primarily dependent on the land. In them only 1/12 to 1/5 of employed persons worked in farming or fishing. This typology differs markedly from U.S. Census Bureau definitions of rural. According to the Census only 10 percent of Maine's communities are urban. According to the Maine State Planning Office only 10 percent of Maine's communities are purely rural.

It will be of interest to test the utility of multidimensional typologies such as those of the USDA and the Maine State Planning Office for social welfare planning and social work practice. I am currently preparing a survey of social work practice in a variety of Maine communities. Community of practice and community of residence will be independent variables. Social workers' perceptions of social work values, practice principles, and salient characteristics of social workers and their communities will be dependent variables (Whitaker, 1982).

FOOTNOTES

[1]Cited in T. Lynn Smith, The Sociology of Rural Life, 3rd edition, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953, p. 15.

[2]Rural sociologist T. Lynn Smith (1953, pp. 8-37), for example, described an area as rural if: (1) it was populated by farmers; (2) its communities were less than 2,500 in population; (3) it had a low man-land ratio; (4) work was carried out directly exposed to the weather; (5) it was made up of segmented, non-integrated homogeneous units; (6) there were relatively small extremes of class; (7) stability overshadowed mobility; (8) primary, personal, face-to-face relations prevailed; and (9) such relations were informal and non-contractual.

[3]The states largest in population are CA, NY, PA, TX, OH, MI, NJ, FL, and MA. The least populated states are NH, ID. MT, SD, ND, DE, NV, VT, WY and Alaska.

REFERENCE LIST

Abbott, G. Developing standards of rural child welfare. Proceedings, National Conference of Social Work, 1927. Reprinted in Emilia Martinez-Brawley (Ed.), Pioneer efforts in rural social work: Firsthand views since 1908. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980, pp. 186-198.

Bachrach, L. Human services in rural areas: An analytical review. Washington, D.C. Project Share - Human Monograph Series (July 1981), No. 22.

Bealer, R.C., Willits, F.K., and Kuvlesky, W.P. The meaning of rurality in American society: Some implications of alternative definitions. Rural Sociology, September 1965, 30, 255-266.

Bertrand, A.L. (Ed.). Rural sociology: An analysis of contemporary rural life. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1958.

Dewey, R. The rural-urban continuum: Real but relatively unimportant. American Journal of Sociology, July 1960, 66, 60-66.

Derr, J. Rural social problems, human services and social policies - working paper 13: Social policies. Denver, Colorado: Center for Social Research and Development, University of Denver, 1973.

Durkheim, E. L'annee Sociologique Vol. II, 1897-1898.

Ecosometrics, Inc. Review of the reported differences between the rural and urban elderly: Status, needs, services, and service costs. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration on Aging. Under Contract No. 105-80-C-065 (Task 2B), draft July 1981.

Farley, O.W., Griffiths, K.A., Skidmore, R.A., and Thackeray, M.G. Rural social work practice. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

Galpin, C.J. Rural life. New York: The Century Company, 1918.

Gans, H. The urban villagers. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Ginsberg, L.H. Rural social work. Encyclopedia of social work (16th edition). New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971, 1138-44.

_____, (Ed.). Social work in rural communities: A book of readings. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976.

_____. Rural social work. Encyclopedia of social work (17th edition). New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1977, 1228-1234.

_____, Wylie, M., Buxton, E. A symposium: Planning and delivery of social services in rural America. University of Wisconsin, 1973.

Godelier, M. Infrastructure, societies and history. Current Anthropology, December 1978, 19, 763-771.

Hauser, P.M. Observations on the urban-folk and urban-rural dichotomies as forms of western ethnocentrism. In P.M. Hauser and L. Schnore, (Eds.), The study of urbanization. London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965, pp. 503-518.

Hines, F.K., Brown, D.L., and Zimmer, J.M. Social and economic characteristics of the population in metro and nonmetro counties, 1970. Economic Research Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Economic Report No. 272, March 1975.

Jenkins, L., and Cook, A.S. The rural hospice: Integrating formal and informal helping systems. Social Work, September 1981, 26 (5), 414-416.

Kretz, S.E. An exploration of the rural health paradigm: The dilemma of low patient usage of sponsored rural physician practices. Brandeis, Ph.D., May 1981.

Levin, L.I. (Ed.). Educating social workers for practice in rural settings: Perspectives and programs. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board, 1972.

Loomis, C.P., and Beegle, J.A. Rural social systems: A textbook in rural sociology and anthropology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

Maine State Planning Office. Economic distress and the changing nature of rural Maine. A new perspective for policy development. Augusta, ME: Maine State Planning Office, June 1979 (draft).

Martinez-Brawley, E.E. The myth of rural social work and the reality of rural practice: Toward a practice definition of rurality. Paper presented at the Sixth NASW Professional Symposium, San Antonio, Texas, November 17, 1979.

_____. Historical perspectives on rural social work: Implications for curriculum development. Journal of Education for Social Work, Fall 1980, 16 (3), 43-50. (a)

_____. Identifying and describing the content of rural in social work. Aretê, 1980, 6 (2), 21-32. (b)

_____, (Ed.). Pioneer efforts in rural social work: Firsthand Views Since 1908. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980. (c)

_____. Rural social and community work as political movements in the United States and United Kingdom. Community Development Journal, 1981, 16 (3), 201-209.

_____, and Munson, C. Systematic characteristics of the rural milieu: A review of social work related research. Aretê, Fall 1981, 6, 23-34.

Munson, C. Social work manpower and social indicators: Rural and urban differences. Human Services in the Rural Environment, April 1978, 3 (4), 29-38.

Munson, C. Supervision and consultation in rural mental health practice. In J. Davenport III, J.A. Davenport, and J.R. Wiebler, (Eds.), Social work in rural areas: Issues and opportunities. Laramie: University of Wyoming Department of Social Work, 1980, pp. 87-93.

Osgood, M.H. Rural and urban attitudes toward welfare. Social Work, January 1977, 22 (1), 41-47.

Pahl, R.E. The rural-urban continuum. Sociologia Ruralis, 1965, 6, 299-329.

Smith, T.L. The sociology of rural life. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

Truesdale, L.E. Current population reports: Population characteristics, The development of the urban rural classification in the United States: 1874 to 1949. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-23, No. 1, 1949.

Warren, R.L. The community in America (3rd edition). Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Company, 1978.

Webster, S., and Campbell, P. Contextual difference in the rural social work environment. In D. Bost, and J. Schmidt (Eds.), 2nd Annual reader of the northern Wisconsin symposium on human services in the rural environment. Madison: University of Wisconsin Extension, 1977, pp. 2-8.

Whitaker, W.H. A survey of perceptions of social work practice in rural and urban areas. Orono, ME: University of Maine at Orono Department of Sociology and Social Work, 1982 (mimeographed).

Wijnberg, M.H., and Colca, L. Facing up to the diversity in rural practice: A curriculum model. Journal of Education for Social Work, Spring 1981, 17 (2), 91-97.

Willits, F.K., and Bealer, R.C. An evaluation of a composit definition of "rurality." Rural Sociology, June 1967, 32 (2), 165-177.

_____, Bealer, R.C., and Crider, D.M. Persistence of rural/urban differences. In D.A. Dillman, and D.J. Hobbs (Eds.), Rural society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980s. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981, pp. 69-76.

Wirth, L. Urbanism as a way of life. American Journal of Sociology, July 1938, 44, 3-24.

Wooster, J.H. Attitudes toward poverty: Social services and adherence to the Protestant Ethic in a rural Colorado community. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, University Microfilms No. 72-23827, 138.

Yoelin, M., and Krishnef, C. A proposal for a study of formal and informal network systems of the rural elderly. In J. Davenport III, et al. (Eds.), Social work in rural areas: Issues and opportunities. Laramie, WY: University of Wyoming Department of Social Work, 1980, pp. 80-86.